

REMARKS

Claims 22-39 are pending. Claim 22-23, 28-29, 31-32, 35, and 37-39 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled. Support for the claim amendments may be found throughout the specification and figures, for example, at Paragraph [0042]. No new matter has been added.

Claims 22-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,053,780 (“Straub”) in view of various combinations of U.S. Patent No. 7,003,304 (“Helferich”), U.S. Patent No. 7,194,249 (“Phillips”), U.S. Patent No. 6,850,604 (“Cannell”), U.S. Patent No. 6,710,715 (“Deeds”), U.S. Patent No. 6,728,522 (“Marrah”), and U.S. Patent No. 7,233,781 (“Hunter”). More specifically, the Office Action suggests that Straub teaches “providing a period reminder ... of an emergency alert broadcast...” (see Office Action – Page 3).

As amended, independent claim 22 recites “a wireless device for receiving an incoming call.” The wireless device includes “a microcontroller ... configured to be a common processor resource for ... first and second receivers of the wireless telephone by ... providing a periodic reminder of [an] emergency alert broadcast at a predetermined time interval ... to [a] user of the wireless device ...” where “the predetermined time interval [comprises] a desired time interval specified by the user”

Straub does not disclose, teach, or suggest providing a periodic reminder of an emergency alert broadcast at a predetermined time interval to a user of a wireless device where the predetermined time interval includes a desired time interval specified by the user. In Straub, a navigation device receives a weather signal from a transmission system or source that includes location information associated therewith (see Abstract; Col. 5, ll. 29-52; Col. 9, ll. 40-65; Fig. 4). The navigation device then compares the location information of the weather signal with the position or location of the navigation device (see *id.*). Based on the comparison, a weather alert can be generated and provided to a user of the navigation device when the navigation device is within an area or predetermined distance of an area issuing the weather signal (see *id.* and Col. 6, ll. 1-23). In Straub, the weather alert can be generated and provided to the user each time the weather signal is received from the transmission system or

source and the navigation device is within the area or predetermined distance (see *id.* and Col. 6, ll. 62 – Col. 7, line 27).

While Straub discloses that weather alerts can be provided each time a weather signal associated with the weather alert is received, Straub does not disclose, teach, or suggest that the weather alert is provided periodically at a predetermined time interval that includes a desired time interval specified by a user. In fact, in Straub, the weather alerts are provided based on a time interval associated with transmission times of the weather signal from the transmission system or source rather than a time interval specified by a user. Thus, Straub does not disclose, teach, or suggest providing a periodic reminder of an emergency alert broadcast at a predetermined time interval to a user of a wireless device where the predetermined time interval includes a desired time interval specified by the user.

Similarly, Helferich, Phillips, Cannell, Deeds, Marrah, and Hunter individually or in combination with each other or Straub do not disclose, teach, or suggest providing a periodic reminder of an emergency alert broadcast at a predetermined time interval to a user of a wireless device where the predetermined time interval includes a desired time interval specified by the user.

Based on at least the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 22 patentably defines over the references as applied.

As independent claims 31 and 32 recite similar, but not identical, features as independent claim 22, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 31 and 32 patentably define over the references as applied. Additionally, as claims 23-30 ultimately depend from independent claim 22 and claims 33-39 ultimately depend from independent claim 32, Applicants further respectfully submit that dependent claims 23-30 and 33-39 patentably define over the references as applied.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 22-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

DOCKET NO.: ATTM-1204
Application No.: 10/760,944
Office Action Dated: October 1, 2009

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are allowable and that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner cannot allow the present application for any reason, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney, Hilary A. Reinhardt at (215) 568-3100, to discuss the resolution of any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 31, 2009

/Hilary A. Reinhardt/
Hilary A. Reinhardt
Registration No. 61,945

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439